

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/388,609	09/02/1999	FISSEHA MEKURIA	2466-36	4221
7:	590 12/14/2001			
NIXON & VANDERHYE PC			EXAMINER	
1100 N GLEBE RD 8TH FLOOR ARLINGTON, VA 22201			ARMSTRONG	, ANGELA A
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2641	
		DATE MAILED: 12/14/2001		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

N

Ÿ				λ
		Application No.	Applicant(s)	,
		09/388,609	MEKURIA, FISSEHA	
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
		Angela A. Armstrong	2641	
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence address	
THE I - External form of the control	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. nsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period we to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, eply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing and patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be ting within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
1)🖂	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 (October 2001 .		
2a)⊠	This action is FINAL . 2b) Th	is action is non-final.		
3)	Since this application is in condition for allowardosed in accordance with the practice under			
Dispositi	on of Claims			
4)🖂	Claim(s) $1-14$ is/are pending in the application			
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw	vn from consideration.		
5)	Claim(s) is/are allowed.			
6)⊠	Claim(s) <u>1-14</u> is/are rejected.			
7)	Claim(s) is/are objected to.			
8)	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	r election requirement.		
Applicati	on Papers			
9) 🔲 🤈	The specification is objected to by the Examine	r.		
10) 🔲 -	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)□ accep	oted or b)⊡ objected to by the Exa	miner.	
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the		· ·	
11)	The proposed drawing correction filed on	is: a) approved b) disappro	oved by the Examiner.	
	If approved, corrected drawings are required in rep	•		
	The oath or declaration is objected to by the Exa	aminer.		
Priority u	inder 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120			
	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).	
a)[☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:			
	1. Certified copies of the priority documents	s have been received.		
	2. Certified copies of the priority documents			
* S	3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bursee the attached detailed Office action for a list of the control of	reau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	•	
14) 🗌 A	cknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic	c priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e	e) (to a provisional application).	
_) ☐ The translation of the foreign language pro Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domesti			
Attachmen	t(s)			
2) 🔲 Notic	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	5) Notice of Informal F	(PTO-413) Paper No(s) Patent Application (PTO-152)	

Application/Control Number: 09/388,609

Art Unit: 2641

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 1-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Basore et al (US Patent No. 5,752,232) in view of Gupta et al (US Patent No. 5,515,475).
- 3. Regarding claims 1-2, 6-7, and 12, Basore et al teaches:

Vocabulary and different groups of words at col. 4, lines 22-29

Speaking voice commands at col. 4, lines 52-56

Selecting from plurality of groups based on words spoken by user at col. 5, lines 9-40

Speaking voice commands into a mobile telephone at Figure 1, col. 2, lines 18-48.

Basore et al teaches that the vocabulary is stored in a database or dictionary, but does not specifically disclose the structure as a trellis. However, refer to Gupta et al who teach a speech recognition method, which implements trellis/tree structures for matching spoken utterances to stored vocabulary words (abstract: col. 4, lines 4-14) for the purpose of reducing the time taken to match a vocabulary word to a spoken utterance and thereby reducing recognition time delay without sacrificing accuracy of recognition (col. 2, lines 12-20).

Application/Control Number: 09/388,609

Art Unit: 2641

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of invention to modify the voice activated recognition system of Basore et al to implement the trellis/tree recognition methods of Gupta et al, for the purpose of reducing the time taken to match a vocabulary word to a spoken utterance and thereby reducing recognition time delay without sacrificing accuracy of recognition, as suggested by Gupta et al.

Page 3

- 4. Regarding claims 3 and 8, Basore et al teaches output of words to be recognized at col. 5, lines 9-40.
- 5. Regarding claims 4 and 9, Basore et al teaches a voice prompter at col. 4, lines 13-21.
- 6. Regarding claims 5, 10, 11, and 13, Basore et al do not specifically teach an automatic word group generation system, however, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of invention to modify Basore et al to generate new groups or menus of words when the size of the word list exceeds a certain number, for the purpose of reducing the number of words output to the user during enunciation or display of active vocabulary words.

4

Application/Control Number: 09/388,609 Page 4

Art Unit: 2641

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments filed October 3, 2001 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

8. Applicant argues that Basore fails to disclose or suggest selection of a group of words based on a word spoken by a user, and thereafter in subsequent speech recognition processes searching only that selected group of words for recognizing speech input. In response, the examiner argues that Basore teaches that the system has access to a plurality of applications for which the phonetic spellings of certain words used in a particular application are available to the device (col. 4, lines 22-29) and the user issues a first command (col. 4, line 49) to select one of the applications. When the user speaks the command "Help", the system provides the active vocabulary of the selected application (col. 5, lines 20-31). Col. 5, lines 31-40 further illustrates the exchange of commands from the user and responses from the system using the selected TV schedule application. Thus, the user issuing the spoken command of "TV schedule" selects the TV schedule application and activates (or selects) the TV schedule vocabulary. Thereby yielding a selection of a group of words from a plurality of groups of words, in which the selected group is based on words spoken by a user, so that a limited group of words, less than said plurality of groups of words, are searched during subsequent speech recognition processes.

Application/Control Number: 09/388,609 Page 5

Art Unit: 2641

9. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Application/Control Number: 09/388,609

Art Unit: 2641

Page 6

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Angela A. Armstrong whose telephone number is 703-308-6258.

The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday 7:30-5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, William R. Korzuch can be reached on 703-305-6137. The fax phone numbers for

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-308-6306 for regular

communications and 703-308-6296 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding

should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

AAA

December 13, 2001

WILLIAM KORZUCH

UPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600